

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 35 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1, 2, 12 and 33 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 3 to 11, 34 and 35 stand objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 13 to 32 stand allowed.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the above application includes patentable subject matter in Claims 3 to 11, 13 to 32, 34, and 35.

Claims 1, 2, 12, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,370,601 B1, hereinafter Baxter. The Examiner stated:

3. Regarding claim 1, Baxter discloses a device comprising: a first I/O bus interface circuit (Figure 8, 870,880); and an on-the-fly message manipulation circuit (Figure 8, 810) connected to said first I/O bus-interface circuit, wherein said on-the-fly message manipulation circuit sets on-the-fly a pre-selected sub-unit of a pre-selected message-unit of a message to a pre-selected state as said pre-selected message-unit is passed through said device (Column 5, Lines 20-34).

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Baxter teaches "manipulations on the data that is undergoing a DMA transfer." (Baxter, Abstract.) However, for an anticipation rejection, the MPEP requires:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." . . . .  
"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim."

MPEP §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 2, p. 2100-73, (May 2004).

Applicant respectfully submits that Baxter fails to show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." First, Baxter teaches that data is manipulated and not messages as recited in Claim 1. Baxter teaches that an opcode is read from a parameter block (PB) and that opcode is used to modify a complete block of data. However, the Examiner has failed to cite any teaching of manipulating the parameter block. See for example,

The Opcode Transaction Block Structure (OTBS) is similar to the STBS and DTBS. The primary difference is that the OTBS contains an Opcode parameter. The Opcode parameter defines the datawise intelligence operation of the IDMAC, upon the DMA data, for the length of the data specified by the Length parameter in the OTBS.

Baxter, Col. 10, lines 18 to 24.

The IDMAC also offers an additional ability not found in prior art devices: the ability to encode opcodes in parametric structures (PBs and/or TBSSs) in memory which can be directly interpreted by the IDMAC and used to manipulate the actual content of the data between the source and destination of the DMA transfer.

Baxter, Col. 28, lines 17 to 22.

the data intelligence unit includes a data manipulation unit for receiving an opcode and altering the data based on a definition of the opcode

Baxter, Col. 32, lines 16 to 19.

Baxter teaches a fundamentally different device from that recited in Claim 1. Baxter teaches all data in a block of data, and not a sub-unit of a message unit of a message or even a message, is manipulated based upon a definition of an opcode in a PB. The Examiner has failed to cite any teaching that

Baxter processes a PB, modifies a sub-unit of a unit in the PB and then passes the PB on.

In contrast, Claim 1 recites in part:

said on-the-fly message manipulation circuit **sets on-the-fly a pre-selected sub-unit of a pre-selected message-unit of a message to a pre-selected state** as said pre-selected message-unit is passed through said device  
(Emphasis added.)

Baxter fails to describe or suggest setting a pre-selected sub-unit of a pre-selected message unit to a pre-selected state and therefore fails to show "The identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and so distinguishes over Baxter for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. In addition, since Baxter manipulates data and not messages there is no need to detect messages. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 2.

Claim 12 depends from Claim 1 and so distinguishes over Baxter for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 12.

Claim 33 relies upon the same information in Baxter as was relied upon for the rejection of Claims 1 and 2. Applicant incorporates herein by reference the above comments with respect to Claims 1 and 2. In particular, the Examiner has failed to identify a message in Baxter, and failed to cite any teaching of modifying a PB. As noted above, the Examiner has failed to cite any teaching or suggestion of modifying the PB.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 33.

Appl. No. 10/068,650  
Amdt. dated November 9, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004 .

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 33 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant has not amended the objected to claims at this time.

Claims 1 to 35 remain in the application. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 9, 2004.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

November 9, 2004  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32,899  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880